

REMARKS

1. Claims 4-15 and 44-69 are currently pending in the present application. The Applicants thank the Examiner for the Examiner's thorough review of those claims in the Action of March 23, 2005 and offer the following comments.

2. In the 'Specification' section of the Action of March 23, 2005, the Examiner objects to the specification by stating that there is no clear support for the phrase "partial recording information objects" of the claims. The Applicants respectfully disagree and direct the attention of the Examiner to the arguments filed by Applicants in the response of August 26, 2004. In particular, support for the above language can be found, by way of example and not of limitation, at page 12, lines 5-8 of the specification as originally filed, as also discussed in the Applicant's response of August 26, 2004.

Therefore, the Applicants respectfully request the Examiner's objection to be withdrawn.

3. In the Action of March 23, 2005, the Examiner rejects claims 4-15, 52, 53, 60, 61, 68, 69 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over either Heo et al or Mishina further considered with U.S. Pat. No. 6,104,684 to Moriyama. The Applicants respectfully disagree.

Claims 4, 7, 10 and 13 recite "*one or more unit audio information attribute information pieces*" that correspond to each of the "*unit audio information objects*" and are "*collectively recorded in the aggregate attribute information area*."

For example, by way of explanation and not of limitation, groups (see, e.g., Groups 1-3 of Figure 6) correspond to each of the VTS (VTS#1,

VTS#2, VTS#n) and are collectively recorded in area 13 (see, e.g., Fig. 4 of the present application). See also, by way of explanation and not of limitation, page 21, lines 12-17 of the present application.

In the Action, the Examiner acknowledges that neither Mishina nor Heo disclose the above features.

Further, at page 5 of the Action, the Examiner states that "Moriyama . . . teaches . . . the ability of having an area for finding the attribute information for all of the recorded information pieces."

However, Moriyama states that "a part or all of the VTS attribute information 12 included, respectively, in the VTS 3 are also included in the control data 11 in the video manager 2" (column 11, lines 24-27) and that "the VTS attribute information 12a may be all or a part of the attribute information in the VTS attribute information 12 in each VTS 3" (column 11, lines 39-42). Moriyama's attribute information "is information which prescribes attributes and/or specifications of the video information and the audio information in the VTS 3" (column 11, lines 16-19) and is "attribute information with respect to the video information or the like included in the VTS #n" (column 11, lines 21-23).

In view of the fact that Moriyama's video information is recorded in the VOBs 10 (column 6, lines 39-43), Moriyama's attribute information corresponds to the VOBs (corresponding to the "partial recording information objects" of claims 4, 7, 10 and 13) and not to the VTSs (corresponding to the "unit audio information objects" of claims 4, 7, 10 and 13).

In sharp contrast, in claims 4, 7, 10 and 13 the "*one or more unit audio information attribute information pieces*" correspond to each of the "*unit audio information objects*".

Therefore, the above feature of claims 4, 7, 10 and 13 cannot be found in Moriyama, and the Examiner is not in a condition to make a prima facie 35 USC § 103(a) case against claims 4, 7, 10 and 13. It follows that claims 4, 7, 10 and 13 are patentable over the art cited by the Examiner, together with claims 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 12, 14 and 15, at least by virtue of their dependence on claims 4, 7, 10 and 13.

Similar observations apply to independent claims 52, 60, 68 and 69 and dependent claims 53 and 61, depending on claims 52 and 60, respectively. Therefore, also those claims are deemed to be patentable over the cited art.

4. In section 2 of the Action, the Examiner further states that claims 44-51 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) for substantially the same reasons as those presented in the previous section. The Applicants respectfully disagree and submit that claims 44-51 are patentable in view of substantially the same reasons as those presented in the above arguments.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of all the claims are respectfully solicited.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required or credit overpayment to deposit account no. 12-0415. In particular, if this response is not timely filed, then the Commissioner is authorized to treat

this response as including a petition to extend the time period pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136 (a) requesting an extension of time of the number of months necessary to make this response timely filed and the petition fee due in connection therewith may be charged to deposit account no. 12-0415.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Post Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope, addressed to: Mail Stop Amendments, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 on

September 21, 2005
(Date of Transmission)

Susan Papp
(Name of Person Transmitting)

Susan Papp
(Signature)

09/21/05
(Date)

Respectfully submitted,



Alessandro Steinfl
Attorney for the Applicant
Reg. No. 56,448
LADAS & PARRY
5670 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite
2100
Los Angeles, California 90036
(323) 934-2300 voice
(323) 934-0202 facsimile
asteinfl@ladasperry.com

Enclosures – Request for Extension form
- Check for \$ 1020